

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 181

JC 740 172

AUTHOR Fletcher, Ellen B.; Opacinch, Cheryl
TITLE Review and Analysis of the Survey on Evaluation of
the Third College Senate.
PUB DATE 30 Nov 72
NOTE 31p.; Third College Senate Ad Hoc Committee
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation; *Institutional Research; *Student
Opinion; Student Organizations; Student School
Relationship; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher
Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Third College Senate

ABSTRACT

In the spirit of self-evaluation and self-improvement, Dr. Walter Weber, president of the Third College Senate, appointed an Ad Hoc Committee last April. The committee was charged with the responsibility of creating an instrument to gather information on the opinions and habits of the Senate's constituents in relation to the entire spectrum of Senate activities, with the understanding that responses were to be limited to the Third Senate only, thus providing an equal vantage point for appraisal for all participants. A questionnaire was designed for this purpose and distributed on a broad basis to all full-time, professional instructional and noninstructional faculty, to all members of the student government association council, and to student members of Senate committees and subcommittees, as well as to student presidents of campus organizations. Detailed results of the survey are presented in this document utilizing a format which gives a descriptive overview of each section, commentary on the numerical totals and percentages, some direct quotations from both faculty and students and, in most instances, the survey questions themselves. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 092181

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY

ON

Evaluation of the Third College Senate

Ellen B. Fletcher
Cheryl A. Opacinch

November 30, 1972

JC 740 172

Introduction

In the spirit of self-evaluation and self-improvement, Dr. Walter Weber, President of the Third College Senate, appointed an Ad Hoc Committee last April, charged with the responsibility of creating an instrument that would gather information on the opinions and habits of the Senate's constituents in relation to the entire spectrum of Senate activities, with the understanding that responses were to be limited to the Third Senate only, thus providing an equal vantage point for appraisal for all participants.

Members of the Committee were Ellen B. Fletcher, Chairman, Robert Keefer, Sarah Korn, Dr. John Murray, David Noveshen, Dr. Cheryl Opacinch and Carol Parlis Daihl.

A questionnaire was designed for this purpose and distributed on a broad basis to all full-time, professional instructional and non-instructional faculty; to all members of the Student Government Association Council; and to student members of Senate committees and subcommittees, as well as to student presidents of campus organizations.

If generalizations can be made, overall evaluation of the responses would indicate that the constituents have a firm understanding of the role of the College Senate as defined by its Constitution--a representative body empowered, through democratic processes, to develop and to make recommendations to the President of the College in the name of the faculty, with provision for full faculty referendum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ORGANIZATION OF REPORT	1
PART A -- DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS	2
PART B -- GENERAL QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE SENATE	3
Attendance at Meetings	4
Atmosphere at Meetings	5
Senate Publications	7
Divisional Senators	8
Senate Charges	10
Opinions	10
PARTS C, D, AND E -- INTERNAL REVIEW	16
PART C -- SENATORS VIEW THE SENATE	17
PART D -- STANDING COMMITTEES VIEW THEMSELVES	19
PART E -- SUBCOMMITTEES EVALUATE THEMSELVES	22
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	26

The organization of this report follows the organization of the questionnaire itself:

Part A describes the respondents in terms of their primary area of responsibility;

Part B presents and discusses all participants' responses to questions of a general nature concerning the Senate;

Part C deals with Senators' views of the Senate;

Part D presents evaluations of Standing Committees by their members; and

Part E is concerned with Subcommittee members; analysis of Subcommittees.

This report concludes with recommendations.

A common format is utilized for each part which includes a descriptive overview, commentary on the questions' responses, selected direct quotations from respondents, recommendations when appropriate, and the actual questions with percentages responding to each option.

PART A - DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

Anonymity of the returns was maintained throughout, with no inquiry as to name, department, or division, although participants were requested to indicate their primary area of responsibility in order to furnish the framework for more precise interpretation of the data, if required, and to aid in the recognition of trends or patterns of response should they develop within a particular sector.

On May 22, 1972, 200 questionnaires were distributed, to be completed and returned by June 1, just prior to final exam week; 147 persons or 59% responded to the survey. Three additional surveys were received too late for inclusion in the numerical tabulations; their comments were reviewed and considered, however.

Of these 147 persons, 76% or 111 were instructional faculty; 11% or 16 were non-instructional faculty; 9% or 13 were Student Government Association Council members; and 5% or 7 were student members of committees, subcommittees or student leaders. That the instructional staff should respond in greater proportion than the non-instructional faculty is not surprising: the Senate, although representative of all segments of the campus community, is considered the major instrument for articulation in the policy-making process by the instructional faculty. Significant, also, is the observation that the Council of the Student Government Association participated 100% as the Council's full complement is thirteen members.

PART B - GENERAL QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE SENATE

Part B presented a group of general questions applicable to all participants, which sought information on patterns of attendance at meetings of the Senate and Senate committees, and evaluation of the atmosphere during those meetings; on reading habits in regard to the three major Senate publications, and evaluation of the contents as a source of campus communication; on assessment of intercommunication with the Divisional Senator and opinion of the Senator's "representativeness"; and on initiation of charges to the Senate and appraisal of the handling of those charges.

Each question also provided space for voluntary explanation of a chosen response or for a brief comment.

Supportive attitude toward the ideal of shared governance, however, was qualified by some serious, constructive suggestions for improvement, by a degree of apprehension concerning the lack of "faith" in the committee/subcommittee system, and by a few sharp words in regard to administrative influence.

Interest in responding to the major open-ended questions was clearly shown as opinions seemed freely stated by all groups of participants with an occasional dash of humor and a remarkable absence of total negativism. Opportunity for brief comment or explanation on individual questions was also utilized by respondents, although to a much lesser degree.

Student responses to both the survey itself and to the opinion questions were clear, direct and of particular interest because they revealed several "blind spots" which can be readily eliminated, such as the lack of familiarity with parliamentary procedure at formal meetings and the lack of awareness of the Senate's open meeting policy.

Detailed results of the survey are presented in the following pages utilizing a format which gives a descriptive overview of each section, commentary on the numerical totals and percentages, some direct quotations from both faculty and students and, in most instances, the survey questions themselves.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Committee, we wish to express our appreciation to all those who willingly participated in the survey and who expressed so candidly their views and suggestions in regard to Senate affairs. The Committee feels that this initial project has achieved

its main objectives and that the information ascertained is of value to the continued success of future Senates which can, from a position of reassurance, confidently give attention to the areas of concern.

Finally, particular acknowledgment is due the staff of the Office of Institutional Research for all their assistance in producing the Survey, as well as this report.

Ellen B. Fletcher
Cheryl A. Opacinch

Attendance at Meetings

Respondents indicated that they 'regularly' or 'frequently' attended meetings of the Senate (32%), subcommittees (24%), and standing committees (13%). Approximately 40% of the respondents said they 'never' attended meetings of any of these groups.

Comments indicated overwhelmingly that "time" was the major factor in non-attendance: insufficient time for obligations; inconvenient hour of meetings; conflict with teaching schedule. One or two respondents stated flatly "no interest," while two others expected to attend more frequently during the coming year.

Comments from students revealed that they tend to feel out of place and that they are unfamiliar with formal meeting procedures; three were previously unaware that they could attend these meetings. "Very pleased," added one.

These findings suggest that better publicity concerning time; place, and agenda of all meetings, as well as reaffirmation of the general open-meeting policy, would be warranted.

1. Do you attend meetings of the Senate?

- 29% 1. Yes, regularly (about 75%)
- 3% 2. Yes, frequently (about 50%)
- 26% 3. Yes, occasionally (less than 25%)
- 42% 4. Never

3. Do you attend open meetings of the standing committees?

- 8% 1. Yes, regularly (about 75%)
- 5% 2. Yes, frequently (about 50%)
- 49% 3. Yes, occasionally (less than 25%)
- 38% 4. Never

5. Do you attending meetings of the subcommittees?

- 17% 1. Yes, regularly (about 75%)
- 7% 2. Yes, frequently (about 50%)
- 32% 3. Yes, occasionally (less than 25%)
- 43% 4. Never

Atmosphere at Meetings

Although most respondents agreed that the atmosphere during meetings 'usually' or 'frequently' permitted free deliberation of all problems, more thought that this was true in subcommittees (88%) than in standing committees (86%) or the Senate (82%). Examining only the 'usually' responses shows a greater spread of opinion: 66% felt that free deliberation of all problems occurred usually, at standing committees, 65% at subcommittees and 48% at the Senate.

Comments indicated that several persons recognized the time factor in limiting Senate debate and thus were dismayed at the disproportionate amount of time devoted to minor points; two others mentioned the 'formal presentation' in the Senate as a deterrent to any real exchange; on the committee level, another believed that the presence of certain administrators seemed to inhibit discussion. A student protested that "student involvement has no real affect on Senators."

The data substantiates the experience that there is more freedom and greater opportunity for exchange of ideas during smaller, more informal committee meetings (therein their strength when functioning properly) than during the necessarily more formal Senate meetings. While 'insufficient time for free deliberation' was not defined, its usage in Senate context implies the inter-

related time available per item, together with the number and scope of agenda items, against a background of rather inflexible, prescheduled dates and times of meetings. Other variables in the creation of 'atmosphere,' such as size and composition of the group, or ability of the chairman, were not isolated for survey purposes although references to these factors will be found in the unstructured responses at the conclusion of this section.

One of the purposes here was to determine the constraining influence, if any, upon the desired atmosphere by the relentless, impersonal element of time, with the assumption that some concrete steps could be suggested to alleviate the condition; questions involving the other variables mentioned above, which frequently hinge on personalities and thus defy redress, were deliberately avoided.

2. Do you feel that the atmosphere during Senate meetings permits free deliberation of all problems?

48% 1. Yes, usually
34% 2. Yes, frequently, but time is insufficient
6% 3. Rarely, conclusions predictable
11% 4. No

4. Do you feel that the atmosphere during standing committee meetings permits free deliberation of all problems?

66% 1. Yes, usually
20% 2. Yes, frequently, but time is insufficient
10% 3. Rarely, conclusions predictable
4% 4. No

6. Do you feel that the atmosphere during subcommittee meetings permits free deliberation of all problems?

65% 1. Yes, usually
23% 2. Yes, frequently, but time is insufficient
5% 3. Rarely, conclusions predictable
7% 4. No

Senate Publications

Over 90% of the respondents indicated they read the Agenda, Summary and Minutes of the Senate. Approximately 80% of the respondents said they read these publications 'regularly' or 'frequently'. Approximately 90% evaluated these publications as 'excellent' or 'good', with slightly more respondents feeling this was true of the Senate Minutes.

Few comments were added and they were primarily appreciative of the work involved, with an occasional "minutes too long," "not prompt enough," and even "never got any" from a faculty member. Or "Could they be shorter? I feel guilty if I don't read them."

Although institutional resources, in terms of expense and time, are required to issue the Senate publications, the data indicates that they are viewed as a good source of information and are well received.

7. The Senate regularly issues three separate publications pertaining to each meeting which provide comprehensive coverage: *Please indicate your reading frequency of each publication.*

	(1) Regularly	(2) Frequently	(3) Occasionally	(4) Never
1. Agenda	76%	12%	6%	7%
2. Summary	63%	23%	8%	6%
3. Minutes	60%	18%	14%	7%

8. Please evaluate each publication as a source of information.

	(1) Excellent	(2) Good	(3) Fair	(4) Poor
1. Agenda	49%	39%	10%	2%
2. Summary	47%	41%	12%	
3. Minutes	55%	38%	7%	

Divisional Senators

70% of the respondents indicated that Divisional Senators represented the views of the Division 'regularly' or 'frequently', 20% said 'occasionally' and 9% said 'no'. 90% of the respondents said that they expressed opinions on Senate issues to the Divisional Senators and 77% said that their views were solicited by the Divisional Senators.

Interestingly, 70% of the respondents said that Divisional Senators 'regularly' or 'frequently' represented their Divisional views during Senate deliberations, yet only 54% said they 'regularly' or 'frequently' expressed their views to the Divisional Senators and 47% said their views were 'regularly' or 'frequently' solicited. Thus, Divisional Senators were perceived to represent the views of the Division to a greater extent than they are perceived to interact with members of the Division in order to obtain their views.

Comments indicated that those replying made a distinction between the Division Chairman, who is an ex officio Senator, and the elected Senator(s). Division Chairmen were observed as being more conscientious in discussing Senate matters and more sensitive to the wishes of their Division, while some degree of dissatisfaction was expressed with the manner in which the elected Senator(s) fulfilled their responsibility toward their constituents. It is admittedly impossible to know the views of all members of a large Division, but it was nonetheless felt that some Senators made no attempt to communicate with their constituents or solicit their opinions. "Why not?" "I wish you would ask them!"

Students emphasized that there was frequent exchange of views at their weekly SGA Council meetings.

A feeling of pique was revealed in three replies from non-instructional faculty members who complained of having only one ex officio Senator and no elected Senator. "Quite frankly, I do not feel adequately represented in the Senate."

Such responses point to a multi-faceted problem evolving from the original Senate Constitution and its formula for administrative department representation, compounded by the substantial increase in professional staff since that time. The situation obviously deserves thorough investigation.

9. Do your Divisional Senators represent the views of your Division during Senate deliberations?

39% 1. Yes regularly
31% 2. Yes, frequently
20% 3. Yes, occasionally
9% 4. No

10. Do you express your opinions on Senate issues to your Divisional Senators?

35% 1. Yes, regularly
19% 2. Yes, frequently
36% 3. Yes, occasionally
10% 4. No

11. Do your Divisional Senators solicit your views, either formally or informally, on problems currently before the Senate?

22% 1. Yes, regularly
25% 2. Yes, frequently
30% 3. Yes, occasionally
23% 4. No

Senate Charges

Only 8% of the respondents indicated that they had initiated a charge to the Senate. Of these persons, 75% were satisfied with the handling of the charge.

Perhaps the greatest value of this question was to publicize the opportunity, open to all, to initiate a charge; comments proved that many were unaware of the availability of the option. Unfortunately, those who had found the handling of their charge less than satisfactory did not volunteer information on the nature of their dissatisfaction.

12. Did you initiate a charge to the Senate through the Vice-President, and, if so, were you notified of the conclusions of the committee's deliberation of the charge?

- 7% 1. Yes, I initiated a charge and was notified
1% 2. I initiated a charge but was not notified
91% 3. No, I did not initiate a charge

If you did initiate a charge (responses 1 or 2 above) were you satisfied with the handling of your charge?

- 73% 4. Yes, the handling was satisfactory
27% 5. No, I was not satisfied

Opinions

Part B concluded with three major open-ended questions, two of which were deliberately structured to polarize the respondent's thinking on the positive and then the negative characteristics of the Senate. Question 15 requested that the respondent define one recommended change for the Senate.

A gratifying 71% of all responding or 104 persons made extensive use of this opportunity: 82 replies were from the instructional

11

staff, 8 from non-instructional staff, 13 from the SGA Council (again 100%), and one from the Student Leader Group. Most followed the question and answer format; some combined their thoughts in one lengthy statement; a few used the occasion to report their serious personal concern about the inadequacy of the College's philosophy and the proliferation of college activities.

All answers to Question 13, which requested identification of some positive aspects of the Senate, were essentially variations on a theme: the constituents perceived the Senate as a strong, viable instrument in representative governance and as an open forum for campus communication, with some expression of tolerance for its limitations. Sample comments on the strengths of the Senate:

It provides a mechanism for the teaching faculty to participate in the formulation of College policy.

Faculty involvement is maximized.

Its capability for accomplishing legislation in a reasonable length of time.

Diversity of its members in terms of abilities, talents and range of opinion.

Inclusion of students; open meetings.

Meetings are conducted in a very fair and business-like manner.

That it exists!

Its representativeness.

Interdepartmental contacts on campus (more of this is needed).

Free discussions.

Efforts of members to constantly improve the mission of the College.

A forum whereby problems of one division can be discussed in relation to other divisions, the administration, and the College as a whole.

Campus-wide deliberation rather than administrative appointed committees.

Its balanced views comprise all segments of the College; as it should be, things are not easy to get through.

It should be gratifying to all those who have supported the concept of a College Senate and all who have actually participated in its activities during its formative years that its strengths can be recognized and defined.

Should it be felt that important aspects have been overlooked, better communication and publicity, particularly directed toward new faculty members, might be the answer.

Question 14, which requested the identification of the weaknesses of the Senate, evoked an overwhelming number of responses from which several dominant areas of criticism emerged: excessive amount of time devoted to discussing minor matters such as semantics, details, and questions that could be resolved outside; lack of preparedness by Senators who have not done their homework, i.e., reading of the committee proposals and the supporting data accompanying the agenda; delay in bringing committee reports to the Senate floor; backlog which creates an unrealistic volume of critical items toward the end of the year; lack of trust in the work of the committees as the Senate seems compelled to redebate the issues; excessive number of meetings in the spring; late hour of the meetings; disproportionately small representation of the student body. Finally, several complained about the devious

employment of Robert's Rules and its jargon, while an equal number desired more strict adherence to parliamentary procedures. Illustrative comments on additional negative aspects of the Senate:

The quorum is too high; Senate body is too large.

Too dominated by the administration: committees and subcommittees are chosen for particular results in mind.

First and second year faculty feel very isolated from the workings of the Senate.

Matters concerning the vested interests of the teaching faculty are affected too much by the voting patterns of the non-teaching faculty.

Charges given to the Senate imply a particular change or desired outcome.

Strong influence in the direction of the administration's wishes.

Senators are not representing their constituency nor voting their wishes.

Greatest drawback is its inability to function quickly.

Students are so outnumbered they feel uncomfortable and hesitate to participate in the discussion.

Three-year terms make Senators complacent.

Lack of representation for service personnel who often have a valuable overview of the campus.

Senate does occasionally get intoxicated with its own power to the neglect of faculty views on important issues.

Human weaknesses and those inherent in the democratic system.

A high degree of perception and a wide range of concern is revealed in these comments which encompass procedures, structure, feelings, and points of personal interest. Many pertain to interrelated or overlapping problems; a number of major issues present themselves for immediate review.

While not every respondent who wrote of an unfavorable aspect of the Senate followed it by an explicit recommendation for change in reply to Question 15, many of the proposed modifications did directly correspond to the general themes of criticism. In addition, there were numerous suggestions on such diverse aspects of Senate affairs that they defy summarization. For example:

Have more student Senators, not necessarily SGA members who are so involved as to have little time for Senate affairs. Could student Senators be elected by the student body?

Great amount of documented research re Senate proposals is shelved in the Library and that's as far as it goes. Would expedite matters if research were presented to staff at a collective gathering.

Have yearly election of Senators with up to three consecutive terms; one-year terms for all.

Change referendum procedure to require 33% of faculty to call a meeting to reconsider a Senate recommendation. The present 15% allows a small minority to pursue personal crusades.

Consider representation of non-professional and supportive staff.

Eliminate needless overlapping of committees and subcommittees.

Form a committee to study ways of improving the interaction between Senators and their constituents.

Have both majority and minority reports.

Members of the Professional Affairs Committee should be elected by the full faculty.

Eliminate Educational Programs Committee and have all curricula matters resolved by the affected Divisions and forwarded to the Administration for final decision, with Senate informed of results.

In summary, this portion of the questionnaire seemed to create a dichotomy among the participants: 71% of the respondents took the time to reply fully, while 29% chose to omit the section entirely. Apparently, the questions gave the majority a welcome opportunity for unrestricted expression of opinion which was utilized with a noticeable degree of enthusiasm to formalize many concerns.

PARTS C, D, AND E -- INTERNAL REVIEW

Sections C, D, and E of the survey presented questions structured for an introspective analysis of each organization--the Third College Senate, the Standing Committees, and the Subcommittees--with respondents limited to members of the respective groups. When the replies were examined in toto, the information disclosed mutual and interrelated rather than exclusive problems, and corresponded with the data previously developed. Noteworthy was the emphasis on the importance of the chairman's role in the effective functioning of a committee.

PART C -- SENATORS VIEW THE SENATE

Overall, Senators were very positive in their views of the Senate.

Most Senators felt that meetings were conducted well, that committee chairmen were well prepared, that the committee recommendations were thorough and conclusive and that the Senate deliberations were 'usually' or 'frequently' thoughtful and thorough. A minority view worthy of consideration was expressed by 30% of the respondents who felt that 'occasionally' or 'never' were Senate deliberations thoughtful or thorough.

39% of the Senators responding rated Senate deliberations as the most influential factor in their decision-making process, with 31% selecting constituents' wishes and 29%, personal analysis. This choice would seem to support and encourage continuation of the Senate's custom of allowing full debate, ~~as far as practicable.~~

Comments from this Senators-only group did not reveal any substantially new material, ~~as previously mentioned~~ weak points were reiterated:

Lack of preparation such as not having read committee evidence supporting a proposal;

Senate debate repetitious of committee deliberation;

Too many details clouding the issues;

Too many meetings.

One Senator expressed the viewpoint: "Rationale is hardly ever sufficient."

Again, the recommendation occurred that course changes and new courses should be the province of the involved Division only.

A student perceived: "Attitude toward student Senators is very hostile...must change to promote a cohesive Senate."

1. Are the Senate meetings conducted impartially and ethically (i.e., conforming to professional standards of conduct)?

82% 1. Yes, usually (about 75%)
 14% 2. Yes, frequently (about 50%)
 5% 3. Yes, occasionally (once or twice)

2. Are the committee chairmen well prepared when they present their committee reports and proposals?

74% 1. Yes, usually
 23% 2. Yes, frequently
 2% 3. Yes, occasionally
 4. No

3. Is the rationale for the committee recommendations thorough and conclusive?

33% 1. Usually
 51% 2. Frequently
 12% 3. Occasionally
 5% 4. No

4. Are the Senate deliberations thoughtful and thorough?

35% 1. Usually
 35% 2. Frequently
 23% 3. Occasionally
 7% 4. No

5. Please rank all the factors listed as to their influence in determining your votes.

	<u>Most Influential</u>		<u>Least Influential</u>
1. Constituents' Wishes	31%	24%	45%
2. Senate deliberations	39%	27%	34%
3. Personal analysis	29%	51%	20%

PART D -- STANDING COMMITTEES VIEW THEMSELVES

Overall, the Standing Committees were very positive regarding the manner in which their committees functioned and the way in which their recommendations were presented. 79% of the respondents felt that all campus viewpoints seemed represented on their committees, although about half of the respondents indicated that they had expressed an interest in serving and about half indicated that they were asked to serve.

The respondents expressed very favorable views about their committee chairmen. 91% said that the committee chairman 'usually' encouraged participation by all members and 100% said that both chairman and sub-committee chairman represented the committee's views and recommendations well and fairly to the Senate.

Respondents were slightly less enthusiastic about the rationale for recommendations presented by the subcommittees. Although 65% said 'usually' the rationale was thorough, 30% said that this was the case 'frequently' or about half the time. Responses also indicated that there was "room for improvement" in Senate deliberations of their recommendations. 36% said that deliberations were 'usually thoughtful and thorough', but 50% said that 'too much time was spent deliberating what was covered in committee.' Interestingly, 14% said that they 'didn't know' which might indicate that they had not attended Senate meetings when their recommendations were presented.

The relatively low attendance of non-members at committee meetings may explain, at least partially, why redundant and lengthy deliberations

occur at Senate meetings. Respondents indicated that about half the time only one or two non-members are present and about a quarter of the time either none or at least five non-members are present.

Members of standing committees also expressed concern about the frequency of student member participation. 37% said that students 'occasionally' contributed, 26% said 'frequently', 21 said 'never' and 16% said 'regularly.'

Comments revealed the prevalent and discouraging feeling that not enough authority is given to the Standing Committees. One member mentioned the isolated view that work often seems to be created to keep the committee busy, while another member felt "the standing committees' real value should be in their availability when a problem arises within their particular jurisdiction."

1. Did you notify anyone that you wished to serve on a particular standing committee?

45% 1. Yes, I checked my availability on the form distributed by the Dean of Instruction.

14% 2. Yes, I notified my Division Chairman, a Senate Officer, or a Committee Chairman.

41% 3. No, I was asked to serve.

2. Did the membership of the committee reflect a variety of viewpoints?

79% 1. Yes, all viewpoints seemed represented.

21% 2. Some were represented; others were not.

0 3. No, membership seemed to represent only one view.

3. Did the Committee chairman encourage participation by all members?

91% 1. Yes, usually (about 75%)

4% 2. Yes, frequently (about 50%)

4% 3. Yes, occasionally (less than 25%)

4. No

4. Did the subcommittee present thorough rationale for their recommendations?

- 65% 1. Yes, usually
- 30% 2. Yes, frequently
- 3. Yes, occasionally
- 4% 4. No

5. Were the committee's recommendations presented to the Senate fairly?

- 100% 1. Yes, chairman and subcommittee chairman represented our views well.
- 2. No, the presentation did not reflect the committee's thinking.
- 3. Other

6. Please evaluate the deliberation of the Senate on the committee's recommendations.

- 36% 1. Usually thoughtful and thorough.
- 50% 2. Too much time spent deliberating what was covered in committee.
- 3. Usually voted without due deliberation.
- 14% 4. Don't know.

7. Approximately how many non-members usually attend committee meetings?

- 25% 1. Five or more
- 54% 2. One or two
- 21% 3. None

8. If students serve on the committee, please indicate the frequency of their contribution.

- 16% 1. Regularly
- 26% 2. Frequently
- 37% 3. Occasionally
- 21% 4. Never

PART E -- SUBCOMMITTEES EVALUATE THEMSELVES

In general, subcommittees were favorable about their functioning and the manner in which their recommendations were received. The subcommittee members were perceived to be diverse in their viewpoints; 78% of the respondents felt that all viewpoints were represented. Slightly less than half of the respondents said that they had notified either the Dean of Instruction or another person that they wished to serve and slightly more than half were asked to serve without prior indication of their interest.

The subcommittee chairman was viewed as 'usually' encouraging all members to participate by 87% of respondents; 11% said he 'frequently' and 2% said he occasionally' did so.

Subcommittees were asked if they used open hearings. Of the one-half who said they had used open hearings, somewhat less than one-half said they were valuable. Although subcommittee members were not asked to rate the quality of student participation, they were asked to rate the quantity. 33% said students 'regularly' participated, 25% said 'frequently' and 42% said 'never.'

Subcommittee members were also asked to rate processing of their recommendations. 76% of the respondents said they were invited to attend the committee meeting during which their recommendations would be considered and 24% said they were not invited; 66% of respondents said that their views had been solicited. In general, respondents felt that the time allotted to present recommendations to the committee was

adequate. 61% said that there was 'ample' time', 26% said it was 'slightly rushed' and 13% said that there was 'insufficient time.'

When asked to evaluate the deliberations of the committee on subcommittee recommendations, 65% of the respondents said that these deliberations were 'thoughtful and thorough.' However, 27% said the deliberations could have been more thorough and the 8% thought there was little or no deliberation which suggests that some improvements might be in order.

Comments concentrated on the difficulties inherent in committee organization: the problem of a common meeting time, the necessity of a capable chairman, the need to select members interested in investigating the charges. One solution offered was a campus-wide arrangement whereby both students and faculty could indicate their interests and preferences for committee assignments. Additionally, earlier appointment of subcommittees was suggested along with equalization of work load and closer coordination with the parent committee. A strong plea was entered for greater reassurance of acceptance of the subcommittee's research and proposals. A note of discouragement was voiced at the poor response to open hearings.

1. Did you notify anyone that you wished to serve on a particular subcommittee?

- 29% 1. Yes, I checked my availability on the form distributed by the Dean of Instruction.
- 13% 2. Yes, I notified my Division Chairman, a Senate Officer, or a committee chairman.
- 58% 3. No, I was asked to serve.

2. Did the membership of the subcommittee reflect a variety of viewpoints?

- 78% 1. Yes, all viewpoints seemed represented.
- 22% 2. Some were represented; others were not.
- 3. No, membership seemed to represent only one view.

3. Did the subcommittee chairman encourage participation by all members?
- 87% 1. Usually (about 75%)
 - 11% 2. Frequently (about 50%)
 - 2% 3. Occasionally (about 25%)
 - 4. No
4. Were you invited to attend the committee meeting when your subcommittee recommendations were being received?
- 66% 1. Yes, the committee sought my rationale.
 - 10% 2. Yes, but the committee did not solicit my views.
 - 24% 3. No, I was not invited.
5. Did the subcommittee have adequate time in which to present its recommendations to the committee?
- 61% 1. Ample time
 - 26% 2. Slightly rushed
 - 13% 3. Insufficient time
6. Please evaluate the deliberations of the committee on your subcommittee recommendations.
- 65% 1. Thoughtful and thorough
 - 27% 2. Could have been more thorough
 - 3% 3. Committee acted with little deliberation
 - 5% 4. None, really
7. Did your subcommittee use open hearings and, if so, were they of value?
- 30% 1. Yes, we found them valuable.
 - 21% 2. Yes, but they were of little value.
 - 49% 3. No, we did not think them necessary.
8. If students serve on the subcommittee, please indicate the frequency of their contribution.
- 33% 1. Regularly
 - 25% 2. Frequently
 - 3. Occasionally
 - 42% 4. Never

Considering Parts C, D, and E as a unit, and recognizing the precisely limited number of respondents in each instance, there is, nonetheless, a discernable lack of verve and of briefness of reply which may be attributed to the overall demands of the length of the combined questionnaires and to the apparent fact that many of the thoughts had previously been expressed. Possibly, also, there was inadequate forenotice of these subsequent inquiries.

Guidelines for future surveys might recommend employment of such simple measures as the use of different colored paper, or individual mailing to members only, for added attention and emphasis.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A valuable body of information, contributed voluntarily and in good faith, has been assembled for the purpose of improving the effectiveness and responsiveness of the Senate and the Senators to all their constituents. Furthermore, each Senate differs from its predecessor in developing its own set of variables reflecting the annual election of officers, the revolving Senate membership, the nature of the charges and resulting problems. It is, therefore, our recommendation that the President of the Fourth College Senate appoint an Ad Hoc Committee charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Examine the material presented here, establish priorities, and, dependent upon this analysis, delineate appropriate action recommendations or commence further investigation.
2. In February, begin to observe the unique problems arising within the Fourth Senate, and while an annual survey is not necessarily recommended, prepare a limited questionnaire addressed to the specific needs identified.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 26 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

EF:CO/n